Extract From

THE

Adwithananda Laharee.

OR

'OCEAN OF BLISS'

BY

Susarla Gopalasastry, B. A.

First Grade **Pleader**

AMALAPURAM



1914

V. N. Press Rajahmundry.

నమఃపరమాత్మనే

అద్వైతానందలహరి

THE RIDDLE OF UNIVERSE.

1. *Q.* Has the universe a cause?

A. The universe being an effect (కార్యం) has a cause, as there can be no effect without a cause; every effect must have cause.

The *Sruti* declares

" కారణేనవినాకార్యంనోదేతి "

'Without a cause no effect Springs into existence.'

2. *Q.* What is an effect (కార్యం)?

A. (*a*) That which is subject to the six-fold changes known as షడ్భావవికారాః is an effect.

(*b*) That which is produced from another is an effect, as curd from milk.

(*c*) That which has ప్రాగభావం and ప్రధ్వంసాభావం is an effect.

(*d*) That which is finite is an effect.

(*e*) That which has parts is an effect.

(*f*) That which is characterised by division among the things of its class is an effect.

3. *Q.* What is meant by షడ్భావవికారాః and what are they?

A. షట్ is six, భావ is existence, and వికారాః means changes or modifications. The expression షడ్భావవికారాః means the six-fold changes which are incidental to the existence of a thing.

The Sruti itself mentions the six-fold changes.

" షడ్భావవికృతిశ్చాస్తి జాయతే వర్ధతేఽపి చ — Vr. Up.
పరిణామం క్షయం నాశం షడ్భావవికృతిం విదుః ॥ — Ad. 1

'The wise understand the six-fold modification as, జాయతే birth, అస్తి existence, వర్ధతే growth, పరిణామం ripeness, క్షయం decay, నాశం destruction.

So, everything that passes through all or any of these changes is an effect.

4. *Q.* What is meant by the అభావ of a thing? What are the kinds of అభావః?

A. The అభావ of a thing is non-existence or absence of the thing; the Abhava of a thing is viewed in four ways, namely, ప్రాగభావః, ప్రధ్వంసాభావః, అన్యోన్యాభావః and అత్యంతాభావః

5. *Q.* Explain the four-fold Abhava with illustrations.

A. ప్రాగభావః—ప్రాక్ + అభావః ; ప్రాక్ prior, అభావః absence. The non-existence of a thing which may yet be *i e.* the non-existence of a thing prior to its existence as such is ప్రాగభావః. Pot does not exist as such before its birth ; it exists only as clay. Pot has, therefore, ప్రాగభావః. As pot does not exist as pot prior to its existence, it is an effect.

ఉత్పత్తేః పూర్వం కార్యస్యాభావః ప్రాగభావః **Ibid.**

'The Abhava of an effect before its birth is ప్రాగభావః'

ప్రధ్వంసాభావః—ప్రధ్వంస + అభావః; ప్రధ్వంస destruction, అభావ non-existence. After destruction, the non-existence of a thing as such is ప్రధ్వంసాభావః, as an earthen pot does not exist as pot, after it is destroyed, it is an effect. The pot after destruction exists as clay.

ప్రధ్వంసానంతరం కార్యస్యాభావః ప్రధ్వంసాభావః **Ibid.**

అత్యంతాభావః—అత్యంత + అభావః; the absolute non-existence of a thing at all times, the past, the present and the future.

అత్యంతాభావః is illustrated by the horns of a hare, the son of a barren woman, the sky lotus &c. These things never existed, they are not existing, nor will they ever exist.

* 'అవస్తుని త్రైకాలికో ఽభావః అత్యంతాభావః'' Ibid.

అన్యోన్యాభావః—అన్యోన్య mutual and అభావః non-existence. It is mutual negation. In gold, silver does not exist and in silver, gold is absent. In one thing the absence of another thing is అన్యోన్యాభావః.

'ఏకస్మిన్ ద్వయోర్నాస్తి, ఘటే పటో నాస్తి, పటే ఘటో నాస్తి.' Ibid

'In one, two things do not exist, as in pot no cloth, *i. e*, in pot both pot and cloth cannot exist.

6. *Q.* What is meant by 'a thing is finite'?

A. A thing is said to be finite (అంతం) when it is limited by time, space and substance.

'త్రివిధం హి ఆనంత్యం దేశతః కాలతః వస్తుతశ్చ' Ty. Av.

'Infinity is three-fold, infinity in space, in time and in substance.'

Similarly, finitude also is three-fold, finite in time, finite in space and finite in substance.

7. *Q.* Clearly explain the three-fold finitude of a thing.

A. A thing is said to be finite in space if it occupies a limited space. It is only the all-pervasive substance like Akasa (ether) that is unlimited in space. It is everywhere seen that that which is produced from another is not all-pervasive. It occupies only a limited space; it is therefore, finite in space. A thing is said to be limited by time when it springs

into existence at a particular time and perishes at some other time. It is only that which has a cause that is limited in time.

"కార్యంహివస్తు కాలేనపరిచ్ఛిద్యతే." Ty. Av. An.I.S.Com.

'It is only the thing which is an effect that is limited by time'.

A thing is said to be finite in substance, when a thing different from it exists. It is the existence of a thing different from another that limits this latter thing. One thing ends when a different thing is cognised.

'భిన్నంహివస్తు వస్త్వంతరస్య అంతోభవతి! Ibid.

For instance, we first cognise a thing, say a cow; when we cognise a different thing, say a horse, we turn away from the cow. This turning away is the end or limit of the thing, cow. If we next cognise an elephant we turn away from the horse. When we turn away from the horse there is an end of the thing of the horse. Here the thing cow is limited by the thing horse which is limited by the thing elephant. In brief, that which is separated from another is said to be finite. It is the division among the various things that limits the things.

'యద్వస్త్వన్యస్మాత్ పరిచ్ఛిద్యతే తదంతం.' Ibid.

'Whatever is divided from another is finite.'

Therefore, it is the effect that is finite in time, in space and in substance.

8. *Q.* State how division among the things of a class characterises them as effects?

A. It has been said that division among things of different sorts is the cause of limitation of the several things. Division is inevitable among things of the same kind and by virtue of the division, the several things of a class become effects. Bhagavan Vyasa explains this characteristic of effects in the Vedanta Sutras.

"యావద్వికారంతు విభాగో లోకవత్" **Br.Ad**2. **P**3. **S.**7

"But wherever there are effects there is division ; as in ordinary life."

9 *Q.* Please explain the above Sutra by means of illustrations.

A. The meaning of the sutra is whatever is divided is an effect and whatever is not divided is not an effect ; the expression 'as in ordinary life' requires to be explained by practical illustrations taken from ordinary life. In ordinary life whenever we observe modifications of a substance, we observe also division. Take the illustrations of gold, clay and iron. Gold bracelets, gold armlets and gold earrings are the modifications or effects of gold. We observe also division among these gold things which are the effects of gold as bracelets, armlets, and earrings. We

observe earthen jars, earthen pots and earthen urns which are all the effects of clay. Here we see the effects of clay *divided* as jars, pots and urns. We observe needles, swords and arrows. These are the modifications of steel. Here we see the effects of steel *divided* as swords, needles and arrows. We thus see in ordinary life that division is the characteristic of effects alone.

"యావత్ వికారజాతం విభాగోదృశ్యతే నత్వవికారే
బ్రహ్మణి లోకేఘటాదిః వికారేష్వేవ విభాగదర్శనాత్"

'Wherever there are effects division is seen and not in the changeless Brahma, as division is seen only in pots &c, which are effects.'

10. *Q.* What do you mean by 'a thing possessing parts is an effect'?

A. A thing possessing parts means a thing which can be separated into parts. It is only a thing which has parts is subject to changes. The changes of growth and decay are possible only of a thing possessing parts. Every effect is a modification. If a thing is without parts, there can be no change in it, either by the accretion to or decrease in, its parts.

"సావయవస్యైవ విక్రియావత్వ దర్శనాత్। యద్ధిసావ
యవంతత్ వికారమాపద్యతే." Ibid.

'Change is seen only in things possessing parts. Whatever has parts gets change.'

11. *Q.* I understand what effect is. How is the universe an effect?

A. The universe is a bundle of things. Every thing in the universe comes into being, grows and perishes. All things pass through all changes. They are characterised by endless division. The things in the universe are capable of division to minuteness. The things of the world are made of the five great elements. The five elements are products, as declared by the *sruti*.

'ఆత్మన ఆకాశస్సంభూతః ; ఆకాశాద్వాయుః ; వా
యోరగ్నిః ; అగ్నేరాపః ; అద్భ్యః పృథివీ.:' Ty. Up. Av. An 1.

'From Atma sprang Akasa; from Akasa, Vayu; from Vayu, Fire; from Fire, Water; from Water, Earth.'

As that which is produced from another is an effect, the five elements, being born from Atma are products. As all things in the universe are made of the five great elements, they are products and are, therefore, effects. The Universe is, therefore an effect.

12. *Q.* Some say that the five great elements are eternal నిత్యాః.

A. The five elements are not eternal in the literal sense of the word. They are called పరిణామనిత్యాః (while-changing-eternals). పరిణామం means changing, నిత్యం

eternal. The elements are eternal while undergoing change. The elements remain up to dissolution (ప్రళయం). Their eternality is only a relative eternality. They are eternal in reference to their effects in the universe, that is, in relation to the things made of elements. They cannot be absolutely eternal as they are products as declared by *sruti.*

13. Q. What is the thing which is absolutely eternal ?

A. Brahma in contradiction with the జగత్ is absoluteiy eternal. Eternality is two-fold.

'నిత్యత్వం ద్వివిధం పరిణామినిత్యత్వం, **B. Gita Ad. II V. 18. A.**
కూటస్థనిత్యత్వం.'

'Eternality is two-fold; changing eternality and unchanging or absolute eternality.'

The eternality of Brahma is the absolute eternality (కూటస్థనిత్యత్వం, the eternality of కూటస్థః). The term కూటస్థః will be explained in its place later on.

14. Q. You say that the universe being an effect has a cause. What is the form of the cause ?

A. It is the form of s.me *existence.* It is some *existing entity.*

15. Q. Some say that before the universe sprang into being there was non-existence or voidness. What do you say to this?

A. This theory is the theory of the శూన్యవాదిః, the atheists. The atheistic theory of the universe presents self-contradiction and is opposed to reason and authority.

16. G.Q. What do you mean by saying that there was non-being or non-existence before the objective world was ushered into existence.' Do you mean to say that 'non-existence' was the antecedent condition or the germinal state of this objective universe *i.e.* that the universe came from the prior state of nothingness, or that 'nothing' existed without reference to the universe, side by side.

S. A. I say that this universe with endless diversity was, before creation, non-existence; in other words, that non-existence is the cause of the universe.

17. G. Q. What is the authority for your statement of 'non-being' being the cause of the world?

S. A. The *sruti* declares :—

"తద్ధైక ఆహుః అసదేవేదమగ్ర ఆసీత్ ఏకమేవాద్వి Ch.Up.
తీయం; తస్మాదసతః సజ్జాయత" Ad.VI.
K.II.M.1

Some say that, in the beginning, this (the universe) was non-being Asat alone one, without a second; and from the Asat, the sat was born.'

18. *Q.* What do you say to the above *Sruti*?

A. The *sruti* quoted by you does not declare the true theory of the cause of the universe. It first puts forward the theory of non-existence as the theory of the athiest, for the purpose of refutation, as implied by use of the expression some say and then refutes the theory in the next mantra, in the words

కథమసతః సజ్జాయెత సత్త్వేవసో మ్యేదమగ్ర ఆసీత్ **Ch.Up.**
ఎక మెవాద్వితీయం. **Ad.VI.**
K.II.m.2

How could, from 'non-being,' being be born? In fact it was being alone that existed in the beginning, one, without a second.

19. *Q.* You say that the theory of non-existence of the world before creation is opposed to reason. How?

A. In the world we see a sprout coming from the seed. The power to generate is visible to all only if the seed exists; earthen jar exists only if clay exists and not otherwise. Moreover there are no instances under observation and no examples within knowledge of the production of things from non-entity. If it were possible, the potter desiring to make jars need not trouble himself for getting and using clay; the gold-smith whenever he wishes, would be able to make gold jewels without gold, as the

effect, according to you, springs into existence from non-entity. So, the doctrine of non-being is untenable and is opposed to reason.

20. Q. You say that the sprout comes from the seed. The sprout is found to appear from the destruction of the seed, which is a negation.

A. There is no negation here. The destruction of the seed means the disintegration of the seed into its constituent parts. These parts of the seed transform themselves into the sprout. It needs no saying that the shape of the seed is not different from that of the constituent parts. So, either in shape, or in substance or in any part of the seed, the seed is not destroyed at the appearance of the sprout.

21. Q. Even the constituent parts of the seed are destroyed.

A. There is no force in your argument. The constituent parts of the seed will have their constituent parts and so on. The destruction of the constituent parts means simply the disintegration of the fine parts into finer parts. As this series of division could never stop, the impossibility of total destruction arises.

22. Q. You say that the atheistic doctrine of non-being is opposed to the *sruti* passages. How?

A. The Chandogya Upanishad says—

"సదేవసోమ్యేదమగ్ర ఆసీత్ ఏకమేవాద్వితీయం" — Ch.Up.Ad VI.K.II M.I

'Being only, my dear, this, in the beginning, was ; one only without a second.'

My dear, this (the universe) was at first pure being, one without a second.

The *Sruti* goes on to say—

"కథమసతః సజ్జాయేతేతి సత్త్వేవ సోమ్యేదమగ్ర ఆసీత్
ఏకమేవాద్వితీయం." — Ch.Up Ad.VI.

'How could being be born from non-being. In fact, it was being alone that existed in the beginning, one, without a second.'

(*b*) The Lord Sri Kristna Says—

'నాసతో విద్యతే భావః నాభావో విద్యతే సతః ।
ఉభయోరపి దృష్టోంతః అనయోస్తత్త్వదర్శిభిః' — Bg.Ad.11 V. 16

From nonbeing there can be no b≥ing ; of the unreal there can be no being. The truth of this has been known by truth-seers.'

(*c*) Bhagavan Sankara says—

కారణమసదితి కేచిత్
కథమత్యసతో భవేన్న కారణతా
అంకురజనకే బీజే
సతిఖలుదృష్టేః సమాఖ్యతే సకలైః — S.Sar V. 77

'Some say that the cause of the universe is non-being ; but causality can never be from non-entity. The sprout-generat-

ing power is seen by all only if the seed exists.'

కారణమసదితికథయన్
వంధ్యాపుత్రేణాస్య హేత్ కార్యం
కుర్వన్మృగతృష్ణికాంభః
పీత్వాస్వన్యాంమహాతృష్ణాంశమయేత్. 78

'He who declares the cause to be non-entity, let him have his business done by the son of a barren woman, and quench his intense thirst with the water of a mirage.'

23. Q. There is a *Sruti* passage which runs counter to the passages quoted above. What do you say to that?

"అసద్వా ఇదమగ్ర ఆసీత్ తతో వై సదజాయత." Ty.Up. Av.An.7

'This was non-existent at first; from it Sat this being, came into existence.'

A. This spiritual text is not in conflict with the texts referred to in question 22. You have misunderstood the sense of the Tityria Text. You will do well to remember that all *Srutis* being emanated from Isvara are acceptable with equal authority. One *Sruti* does not clash with another. The sense of the Mantra is, this, the universe, differentiated by name, form and Karma, was non-existent in the manifested and evolved condition it now exists; that is, this manifested universe divided with distinctions

of name and form, was an unmodified, unmanifested, unevolved cause, Brahma; from the unmanifested cause came this manifested world of multifariousness. The 'non-existence' *Asat*, does not mean absolute non-existence but only the non-existence of the universe as it now exists fully manifested and modified. On this text Bhagavan Sankara comments as—

"అసదితి వ్యాకృత నామరూపవిశేష విపరీతరూపం అవి **Ty.Up.**
కృతం బ్రహ్మత్యుచ్యతే పునరత్యంతమేవాసత్ నహ్య **Av.An.7**
సతస్సజ్జన్మ." **S.Com.**

By non-existent' is meant the immutable and unmodified Brahman as opposed to *this* the universe, manifested in name and form. The word Sat is used in the Titheriya Sruti, in the sense of the manifested world of endless diversity. That which is not Sat is Asat, the unmodified Brahma. Asat does not mean absolute non-existence. If it meant absolute non-existence, other spiritual text would be stultified.

"కథమసతస్సజ్జాయేత." Ch.Up.
Ad.VI.K, II
M.2

'How could being be born from non-being.

"సదేవ సోమ్యేదమగ్ర ఆసీత్." Ch.Up.
K.II.M.I.
Ad.VI

'Pure Being, my dear, this (the universe) was at first (before creation).'

" ఆత్మావా ఇదమేక ఏవాగ్ర ఆసీత్." It.Up. K.I.M I.

'Atma indeed, this (the universe) was, one only at first.'

" బ్రహ్మవేదమగ్ర ఆసీత్ " Bh.Up.Ad.III B.IV.M.10

'This was at first Brahma.'

These authorities clearly show that the universe before creation was some unmodified existence known as *Sat*, *Atma* or *Brahma*. That *Asat* is used in the sense of unmodified and unmanifested Brahma is made clear in Brihidaranya.

" తద్ధేదంతర్హ్య వ్యాకృతమాసీత్. తత్-హా-ఇదం-తర్హి-అవ్యాకృతం-ఆసీత్. Bh.Up. Ad.III.B.IV. M.7

'This, the world manifested in name and and form was in the beginning, the unmanifested and unmodified (అవ్యాకృతం) Brahma, the cause The word అవ్యాకృతం means that which is not of వ్యాకృతనామం manifested form So, the అవ్యాకృత is used as synonymous with Asat

24. Q. You say that the atheistic doctrine of non-being presents self contradiction; How?

A. It is a well-known principle that that from which anything proceeds must be something existing. As the world comes,

according to you, from Asat, non existence, non-existence becomes as good as existence; to say that non-existence is existence is as rational and logical as to view light and darkness as one. Hence arises the alleged contradiction.

25. T. Q. You say the cause of the world is non-existence. What is the nature of the causality ?

A. I don't exactly catch you. I use the word cause, in the sense of being the source.

26. Q. What do you mean by the nature of causality ?

A. By 'nature of causality' I mean whether non-existence which you say is the antecedent condition of the world, is the material or the operative cause of the universe.

27. Q. What do you mean by the material cause of a thing?

A. The material cause is the cause which gives being to the thing. It forms the matter of the thing without which the thing cannot exist. A thing is the material cause of another when the relation of substantial causality exists between the cause and its effect, that is, when the cause abides in its effect as its substance and when the effect is non-different from its cause. The material cause or the *Upadanakarana* is the mediate and proximate cause; Upadana

is the matter or material of which a thing is made. Golden jewel can never exist without gold forming its substance; earthen jar cannot exist without clay forming its matter; iron scissors cannot exist without iron forming its substance. In all these cases the cause, namely, gold, clay, iron, abides in its effects, gold jewel, earthen jar, iron scissors. The relation between the cause, gold &c., and the effect jewel &c., is one of substantial or material causality. So, gold is said to be the material cause of gold jewel, clay of earthen jar and iron of scissors.

28. Q. What is meant by the operative cause of a thing?

A. The operative cause or నిమిత్త కారణ is the cause which is instrumental in bringing about effects. The relation between the operative cause and the effect is one of operative causality.

The operative cause is known as the instrumental cause. The operative cause is best defined as the cause which gives a *particular shape to the material cause.* Goldsmith is the operative cause of gold jewel, while gold is its material cause; potter is the operative cause of earthen jar, while clay is its material cause. The operative cause is credited with agency and is always distinct from and external to, the material cause which is worked out

into an effect. In the case of the operative cause the effect can be conceived apart from the cause.

29. Q. I understand the two-fold causality. I say that Asat non-existence is the material cause of the universe.

A. This is unsound. If nothingness were the material cause of the universe, it must form the matter or substance of the things in the world. The universe according to you, being the effect of nothingness, ought to have been comprehended as non-existing. For, as nothingness is not comprehended as something existing like a pot, the universe which is a thing made of nothingness would, therefore, have to be comprehended as something non-existing ; but as a matter of fact we comprehend the universe as something existing just as we do a pot. Asat cannot therefore, be the material cause of the universe.

30. Q. If *Asat* 'non-being' cannot be the material cause, it is the operative cause of the universe.

A. This argument too is untenable. It has been shown that agency is attributed to the operative cause. Agency implies intelligence, capacity and co-operating auxiliaries which are evidently absent in the case of 'non-being.' It, therefore, offends reason to say that Asat, non-

existence," is the operative cause of the objective world. If non-existence were the operative cause, with what material does it produce the world? Thus in any view of the case you are driven to the necessity of admitting the cause of the world as some existence ('Sat'), as the world has been shown to be an effect.

31. Q. I say that this world was at the beginning 'non-existence' and that the apparent world that comes from it is an illusion, not a reality, so, nothingness is the source of this unreal world.

A. This position of yours is not tenable. For an illusion to arise, there must be some real thing, some resting place on which illusion abides In the illustration of rope and serpent, the *illusory snake* is possible only on the *real rope* without seeing which there can be no mistake, the mistaken notion of silver in the mother-of-pearl is possible only if there exists the real thing, the mother-of-pearl, the notion of silver which is imposed on the mother-of-pearl is false So, the mistaken knowledge or illusion is possible only on a real substance which forms the substratum for illusion. In the present case the illusory world abides, according to you, on voidness which is not something real, nothingness cannot

ADWITHANANDA-LAHAREE.

The Ocean of Bliss.

This philosophical book gives what is contained in the 108 Upanishads, Brahmasutras, the Bhagavadgita, the Panchadasi and the original works of the Bhagavan Sankara.

***Object*:-** The object of the book is to disclose and explain exhaustively the real import of the texts of the Upanishads.

***Plan*:-** The subject matter of the 108 Upanishads with Sankara Bhashya and Deepika, Brahma Sutras with Bhashya, Bhagavadgita with Bhasya and the Panchadasi with its Commentary and of the original works of Sankara, is arranged and analysed under several heads and exhaustively treated of in the form of questions and answers which may amount to nearly 3000.